

**SUMMARY MINUTES
CITY OF SEDONA
CITIZENS STEERING COMMITTEE FOR
SEDONA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
Community Plan Room, 1725 W. Hwy. 89A, Suite D, Sedona, Arizona
Tuesday, January 29, 2013 at 3:00 p.m.**

1. Verification of Notice, Call to Order, and Roll Call.

The meeting was called to order at 3:03pm by Chairman Thompson and roll call was taken.

Committee Members: Chairman Jon Thompson, Vice Chairman Rio Robson (excused), Mike Bower (excused), Jim Eaton, Angela LeFevre, Barbara Littrell (joined at 3:06pm), Marty Losoff, Gerhard Mayer, Elemer Magaziner, Judy Reddington (excused), John Sather

Staff: Mike Raber, Cynthia Lovely, Johannah Rutschow

Other: Vice Mayor Mark DiNunzio, Sandy Moriarty (Housing Commissioner)

2. Announcements from staff and Committee.

No announcements from staff.

Marty Losoff inquired about the Parks & Rec presentation to City Council. Jon Thompson responded by saying that the presentation to the City Council did not have any action. The Committee sent along its recommendations and motion; the Council was aware of this and understood where the Committee was coming from. Jon Thompson spoke at the meeting and reinforced what was said by the Committee. There was no action planned to be taken at that time. Since that time Parks & Rec Commission had a meeting with the City Council regarding the master plan. It was decided that the Commission go through every detail of the master plan to make a recommendation about it. Gerhard made a suggestion to not do anything but to ask the Parks and Rec to be at the meetings. The capital improvements in the master plan are in line with what was heard from the public.

Jon Thompson stated that there are two activities coming up that the Committee needs representation at:

- Red Rock Trails Planning on February 28 at the Hilton. Angela LeFevre is not able to be at this meeting.
- City Council Coffee Chat on February 7 from 8:15am - 10am. Barbara Littrell will represent the Committee.

3. Public forum for items not listed on the agenda.

Chairman Thompson opened the public forum and having no requests to speak, closed the public forum.

4. Discussion/possible action on City of Sedona draft Mission statement

Jon Thompson was in attendance at the City Council meeting where they discussed a Mission statement. Staff and Council came up with some different possibilities for this statement. Jon Thompson's impression was that the Council was unsure if they needed to do this, but they decided to move forward with it. The Council indicated that perhaps they needed feedback from the Citizens Steering Committee (CSC). They have asked the CSC to respond to the Council with any recommendations since the CSC is doing long-range planning.

Angela stated that she thought the City already had a Mission statement. Barbara indicated that the City does have a Vision statement, but not a Mission statement. Barbara said that a Mission statement is basically a two-sentence statement. A Vision statement is a longer document. Staff looked at other cities' Mission statements and pulled some out that were reasonable.

Angela observed that there is no mention of "small town". Barbara clarified that this is a Mission for the government, not the city.

Elemer replied that a Vision is a picture of the city in the future. A Mission is what the city government does. The Vision doesn't have any verbs in it. The Mission says what the City does, like provides services and fosters public trust. It could say "foster small-town community" as a possibility.

Marty stated that he has found that over the years many people throw these statements out because they don't mean too much. He is not sure that the Committee should spend a lot of time on what the City's Mission statement should be. This is not a good use of time given the Committee's own priorities.

Jon Thompson stated that in the interest of time, should the Committee do work on this or tell the Council that they can move forward with this because it doesn't affect the Committee? Jim Eaton asked if the Chair could define time and then asked what the purpose of the Vision statement is. Mike Raber responded that Elemer gave a good definition.

John inquired on the purpose of the City's Mission statement. Gerhard asked if this was based on the public findings. If not, then he doesn't care.

Jon Thompson stated that this is something to guide the government in their activities.

John Sather said that the Committee has too much work to do to spend time on this. The City Council shouldn't spend time on this – it should be put on a ballot.

Angela stated that this is extremely important because it is how the City communicates with the public.

Mike Raber stated that he doesn't think the Council is looking to make that kind of recommendation – they want input on the statements. Barbara disagreed and stated that the Council is open to any kind of suggestion. Jon Thompson agreed with Barbara and stated that the guidance he received was that if there is anything the Committee wants to contribute, then the Council will wait to hear about that. He went on to say that he sees consensus on two things: that this isn't something for us to be involved in, and we're not sure that what they are doing here is appropriate – this should be something for the public to do. He asked for a quick show of hands in support of these statements and found consensus. John Sather stated that he doesn't think the City Council should be doing this. This should be up to the citizens. Marty agreed with that and stated that most people don't differentiate between a Mission or Vision statement. He would go so far as to say to not have a Mission statement.

Jon Thompson stated that this should be the activity of the staff on how they are going to motivate the employees. The message will be taken back through staff.

MOTION: Marty Losoff moved that it is the Consensus of the Steering Committee to not be involved with, or comment on, the Mission statement at this point since we have other priorities. Secondly, it is also the consensus of the Steering Committee that if a Mission statement is developed, it should have input from the community. Elemer Magaziner seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried eight (8) for and zero (0) opposed. (Vice Chairman Robson and Commissioners Bower and Reddington excused)

5. Discussion/possible action on public survey/questionnaire.

Jim Eaton stated that he feels there is information that the Committee still needs to make a good run at writing a plan; this information has nothing to do with E-T-C. What he sees is a short letter, return post-paid envelope, and, depending on how far we want to go, to every household by mail. Marty Losoff stated that he is not opposed to the survey but would like to see the feedback from the questionnaires from the three major meetings. If we do the survey, he would like to see different questions. For example, more affordable lodging – does Sedona want affordable housing? If we do this, let's really look at these questions and get the most out of them.

Angela stated that her first reaction was - not another survey. She saw redundancy in some of the questions and felt that some of the answers would be found on the Parks & Rec survey. She thought that if she is feeling this way, then what will others think? She mentioned that we put the tabloid out there already.

John Sather stated that Jim Eaton had obviously put a lot of work into this. He thinks that what is needed is a step-by-step process of how to get to the end. Somewhere along the line the Committee will agree or disagree on the direction and then they will know what to ask and will have more focus. He also feels that an independent survey analyst should be hired if there is to be a survey; surveys are most successful if they are done by a third party. In the past the consultants recommended that we do a telephone, not mail-in, response, and he is not sure what someone would say now. Recently another group said that a focus group setting would provide more useful information than a survey. He is not agreeing or disagreeing with this survey. However, he feels we first need a clear path to the finish. There are already those that are skeptical on how we are going to use the blue dots.

Gerhard Mayer indicated that surveys are useful, but we have surveyed enough. We are still going to get responses from the tabloid. We are done with gathering. He doesn't see the purpose of reaching out beyond what has already been done. He gets the sense that there is insecurity that the Committee hasn't done their job.

Barbara Littrell thinks that looking at the timeframe (now to March 2014), there isn't enough time. She doesn't think we can do a shotgun survey. It needs to be as scientific as you can get. She is suggesting asking people from the survey email list (hundreds of people, according to staff) for feedback if we need something. At this point, she thinks a survey is not what we need. She commented that Jim's survey is fabulous - he did an amazing job - but she doesn't see where it fits time-wise. Mike Raber commented that this survey could be done in less than a year; it would be tight for when we need to use this.

Elemer Magaziner commented that on the tabloid questionnaire there was a blank space for the public to write in comments. He sees this survey as a guide that might help people to do that. When he reads these things, they are outside of what the public could respond to on the ETC questionnaire. This is a supplement to what you may not be able to pick and choose on the other pages. Perhaps it is already too late for that, though. He doesn't see this as something that needs to a formal, scientific thing at all, unlike the other things on the ETC.

Jon Thompson asked if that is a positive thing that it's not scientific. Elemer responded that it is a positive. Mike Raber then commented that in the past, there have been some non-scientific surveys to get some general thoughts. If it's going to be a full-blown survey, however, it should be scientific.

Marty stated that he was in favor of a survey a year ago. He doesn't think there is time. He feels the Committee gathered a lot of information and thinks the next steps should be a decision on where they are going from here. He is comfortable where they are today, but is the Committee comfortable? He is hearing that there is not a comfort level with the ETC. If that's true, then the Committee should discuss that. If not, let's move on. Rather than a survey, they should come up

with 5-10 talking points and go out to the community with it, like Rotary, City Council, etc – and gather the information in that forum. The next step in the process should be a clear picture of where the Committee is today, where they want to go, and what the final questions are.

Jim Eaton stated that the Committee has been obsessed since the middle of last March to what amounts to a survey. He has had concerns about ETC from the beginning, but he worked hard to make it work. He wanted to do this survey when the Committee was talking about neighborhood meetings last fall. However, others did not want this. He feels that they could get this survey done and get results back at the end of February. This is a simple format that a lot of professionals use. As far as duplicating questions, that is a strategy to compare answers. ETC was rather narrow, and the results are beginning to shape up as inconclusive. He feels that they can find out some definite information in an easy way. These questions are based on input from the topical workshops and all of the other meetings. The questions came from that. If someone can write a better survey, then that person should do so.

John Sather commented that Jim has made several inflammatory statements that the ETC is inconclusive. That is problematic. He then read a portion of the survey that stated that the City should acquire property for a central gathering place. This would kill off the idea. He stated that he and Mike Bower have talked about methods to do this, and where that type of question comes from is unknown. He feels this survey would put a tailspin on the process. With all due respect to the time of a survey, it would not take a year. If the Committee agrees to a survey at some point, then they could put something together that is homespun or bring in a random group to analyze this and use the correct verbiage. It is clear to him what steps to take next, but we need to work within the Committee. We need to have agreement of what the process is. Indicating that we need to do another survey says that we do not know how to move forward.

Marty Losoff commented that he is ready for the Committee to write a plan. They need to put a draft of the plan together and get it to the community and have them take a look at it. The Committee has built up time and energy regarding the ETC meetings, and it's a small part of the agenda today. The Committee should be talking about: What do we do, what did we learn, where are we going. They need to come to grips as a Committee if they are satisfied or not, instead of coming up with incremental steps to the process. He recommends the Committee hold off on a survey and come up with 5-10 questions and then get verification from the community. He inquired about what the Committee would get out of the questions on this survey

Jim Eaton stated that he did not intend this survey to be sent out as is. He stated that he put a couple of booby traps in it, and welcomed the Committee to look at this in a productive way. He doesn't believe they found out everything they needed to know via ETC. There are still some things they need to test, and some of those things are in this survey. He would welcome some constructive questions on how to develop a survey, rather than move ahead like the Committee knows everything.

Jon Thompson responded by commenting that he is not terribly happy with the idea of "booby traps" in the survey and stated that the Committee needs to deal with each other with honesty. At this point, Jim retracted the term and called them "test questions". Jon Thompson continued to say that he hopes things are presented in good faith. Jim commented that it got some discussion going. Jon Thompson went on to say that he found himself agreeing with the other comments regarding waiting until we get the ETC information. The approach to the survey should be to see what is missing and then to fill in the blanks. If this requires a professional survey or an informal survey, then that should be done.

Angela agreed, but stated that they don't know yet what the tabloids say. The Committee has until the end of the month, and until then, the Committee is stumbling in the dark. Jon Thompson responded by saying that they have 100 online surveys and over 60 paper surveys. There are a lot of opened-ended answers. He hopes to close this off on Thursday and have a meeting Friday to

discuss how we're going to get this information tied together and provide some preliminary numbers for the meeting next Tuesday

Jim Eaton stated that he has given up on the survey, and they will forge straight ahead into the fog. He then showed the pictures and counts of the dots from the three meetings. He stated that there is something to be gained from this. What he gained is that this is inconclusive because some people came back for extra dots. Jon Thompson stated that he would like to discuss that later on the agenda. He also stated that there is consensus that we hold off on the survey now, and we'll figure out the information needed and move forward at that time.

6. Discussion/possible action of Committee retreat proposal

Jon Thompson then turned the discussion over to Elemer Magaziner.

Elemer stated that the Committee agreed to have a retreat, and there were suggestions on length and on activities. The retreat is scheduled for February 9. He then asked for reactions to this.

Marty stated that he is not in favor of a retreat because he does not see a purpose. Also, February 9 is a problem.

Barbara commented that now is a good time for a retreat, since the Committee is moving from a gathering phase to a working with the public phase. The Committee has gone into the other meetings where they have not had a lot of personal training. There is an NAU professional that has a program that relates to listening and understanding, and that may be useful in presenting a plan.

Angela stated that she is all for consensus and thinks the Committee in particular needs that. She personally needs direction and a purpose for where the Committee is going.

Jon Thompson is fine with the retreat but is concerned about the activity description, specifically leadership concepts. He feels that they need discussion on how a Committee works together, rather than leadership, and also how a Committee agrees, commits and what to do when there is a conflict with personal preferences.

John Sather stated that he agrees with Marty's comment but "less harsh". He stated that the Committee has a tremendous amount of work to do and already knows how to do it. His way may not be the Committee's way. He worries that the Committee is underestimating the next phase. He doesn't want to stop the negative banter. This is worth having a real debate about; he wants to have those vigorous debates. He has been to many retreats where an expert comes in to tell them how to feel or act, and he is not interested in that.

Gerhard sees a purpose in having someone give the Committee ideas on how to act and on leadership. He also sees the retreat as something beyond that, like getting to know each other besides sitting in a meeting. He will bring whatever needs to be brought to the table for this.

Jim Eaton commented that this is a team, and the Committee needs to be better at working as a team. No two or three people can write this plan; everyone will have to play a strong part. If this plan is to be worth anything, it has to be the plan of the people of Sedona, not of this Committee. He has no problem with anything on the agenda. He can afford to hear a talk about leadership of a Committee, not one person. He wonders if such a retreat shouldn't be held on neutral ground. He doesn't know why this would cause discomfort (it might be a public perception thing) and suggested the conference room at Yavapai College. He would like to see this retreat considered.

Mike asked if the 23rd is still a viable date in the event that something happens and they can't pull the retreat together. He also asked if the facilitator will be Andrea, and also that he needs to discuss a budget together. Elemer said that Mike needs to speak with Andrea.

Marty asked for the agenda items for the retreat. Elemer stated that they will discuss all of the things that were just brought up. Marty stated that there is a concern that a couple people are running the plan, that it doesn't represent us all, and that the Committee is too hung up on ETC. He doesn't agree with this, but this should be discussed. He thinks that is why they are having the retreat. This is the crux of the problem. John Sather stated that this is a non-issue b/c we're not going forward with ETC. It is a tool to get information to a broader set of issues. He doesn't know that he wants to sign up for a morning with an unknown agenda. He stated that he feels the meeting should be about setting up a process. Maybe the facilitator could have a leadership presentation, and after that they should discuss how to finish this process. Some of the process is not debatable - someone needs to write, to format, to proofread. If that is part of the agenda, that would be productive. A touchy-feely piece is not what he would like.

Jon Thompson stated that they have gotten off the track as to the purpose of the retreat. There was a feeling by a couple Committee members that the Committee is not working together properly, not listening, etc. The retreat would be a place to not talk about business but get to know each other better; that would help the last sprint to the finish line. Jon stated that he will support the retreat if that is the agenda. There needs to be a vote on whether or not to have the retreat.

Elemer reaffirmed that this is not about business or the project. If it needs to be about the project itself, then there can be another meeting. Marty asked who decided this. Jon Thompson responded that the Committee is deciding this right now. This is a proposal to talk about non-business things. If you don't think it's necessary, vote no.

MOTION: Elemer Magaziner moved that we hold the retreat as described in here, and the agenda is not going to be about business. Gerhard Mayer seconded the motion.

Barbara responded that there has been concern since the Committee began. Elemer has experience in this sort of thing, and she is in favor of this based on her trust of Elemer.

VOTE: Motion carried seven (7) for and one (1) opposed. (Marty Losoff opposed; Vice Chairman Robson and Commissioners Bower and Reddington excused)

7. Discussion/possible action on Committee leadership and possible election

Elemer stated that the whole point of this is how do we move forward? What are we going to do next? The question is: How can we use the 11 people's experience and abilities in the best way in order to go forward to the next part of this project. This is the question that he wants to ask – how do we lead it – how do we organize it – do we let John tell us what the process is because he has done it so many times – does he throw it out there so we can critique it. In the handout are three ovals. Self-preservation means that you can bring yourself to the Committee as who you are and what you believe in. The leader needs to make sure that this is possible. He has personally felt that he's been shut down many times. The second - Belonging - means that we can work on a team. He feels the Committee is already good at this. The outermost oval refers to working together; it is not referencing individual skill and experience. The big question is how we maximize use of everyone's abilities and experience. We have actually been talking about this concept for the last hour.

John expressed some confusion regarding if the Committee should be voting on something. Marty asked if the Committee is supposed to be electing a chairman. If so . . .

MOTION: Marty Losoff moved to elect Jon Thompson. Barbara Litrell seconded the motion.

Jon stated that Elemer asked for this to be put on the agenda to discuss leadership of the group, in particular to maximize the potential and value of everyone at the table. He doesn't believe it is appropriate to jump to an election before the discussion is done.

Angela stated that she likes the idea of everyone contributing to the process. She feels like she missed quite a bit from the last year. She spent a lot of time in various communities, talking with many people and seeing how people came up with visions. She would like the Committee to ensure they listen to the right people to make the plan. Elemer stated that she has made his point: everyone here has things to contribute and hasn't had a chance. Whoever leads this needs to make this possible. He doesn't know what Gerhard brings to the table; he does know what John has to bring. He is talking about this agenda item because moving forward, they need to know what everyone can contribute.

John Sather stated that he is confused by the agenda item, and that there is an open motion on the table that has to be dealt with. He is all for everyone contributing, but there are some specific duties that need to be covered. He wants a process first, and then they can go around the table to see who can do what. He believes the Committee has been doing just fine; everyone has done different duties so far. He would like the process to be defined. He thought this agenda item was to elect a new chairman. He believes that Jon Thompson, if he wants to do this, would be a fine leader moving forward. What the Committee needs to do is give him the path. This needs to be an agenda item.

Elemer restated that how we work together to get the process is as important as the process we come up with. Getting the process first is the cart before the horse. He agrees with John that there needs to be agreement on how to come up with the process.

Jon Thompson believes there is some middle road and stated that it's important for the Committee to know its strengths. He stated that what he heard earlier is that first they need to find out what everyone can do so everyone can do something. He commented that he and Mike had a conversation a while ago about what should be done once the ETC thing is over. The way to go about this is to figure out what we need to do, and then to see who can do those things. He does not believe it is necessary for everyone to be involved in every aspect. If his skill set is not right for what is coming up, he will take a more supporting role. If anyone wants to be involved and feels they can be involved, then the retreat would be a great way to let each other know that. There are two major activities – writing, editing, production and also selling – to Planning & Zoning, City Council and the public. These may be things that Angela was talking about. The Chairman doesn't need to be doing the selling.

Jim Eaton stated that the reason this came up originally is because the Committee agreed the Chair would serve for one year. In November the subject of electing a new chair did not come up. He also understands this agenda item to be a discussion about defining the role of the Chair, not just having a chair election. There is nothing more to it than that; it is nothing personal.

Marty stated that both Jon Thompson and Jim Eaton as Chairman listened almost to a fault. He has been shot down many times, but that doesn't mean he doesn't have a say. Just because we are not agreed with doesn't mean we're not listened to. He spoke with Rio, and Rio does not want to be Chair. It would have been natural for him to step in. Marty feels Jon Thompson has done a good job so far, and feels that wherever they go, they have a pretty good perspective on how to get there.

CALL THE (PREVIOUS) QUESTION: Marty Losoff stated that he would like to call the question.

There was then discussion on the term "call the question" before it was decided that they would vote on the motion still on the floor. That motion was restated by Marty as, "I nominate JT to serve another year as Chairman". Jon Thompson asked if there needed to be a time period attached and asked for a motion restated to make the timeframe open ended, as there could be an election at any time if the Committee wishes. Marty then restated his motion again and the second agreed.

AMENDED MOTION: *Marty Losoff moved that JT continue on as Chairman of the Citizens Steering Committee for the Sedona Community Plan Update. Barbara Litrell seconded the amended motion.*

Jim Eaton stated a point of order - there first should be a vote on the call.

VOTE ON CALL FOR THE (PREVIOUS) QUESTION: *Call for the (Previous) Question carried eight (8) for and zero (0) opposed. (Vice Chairman Robson and Commissioners Bower and Reddington excused)*

Jon Thompson then asked for a vote on the amended motion on the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDED MOTION: *Amended Motion carried eight (8) for and zero (0) opposed. Vice Chairman Robson and Commissioners Bower and Reddington excused)*

8. Discussion/possible action on City Council input.

Postponed until next meeting.

9. Discussion and debriefing on E-T-C January meetings

Jon Thompson began this item by going around the table to gather everyone's impressions of the three meetings.

John Sather stated that he spoke with no one who wasn't wildly happy with the process. He had a couple of in-depth talks with a couple people that were very committed to some components, like the environment. He was also cornered by someone who wanted to know how they would use the dots. His answer was that the Committee knew this was an imperfect process. It was about conversations and overall input and feelings. He described it as "reading the tea leaves" if they got strong reaction one way or another. In his view the results was more conclusive. He heard more of a centralist thinking, incorporating pieces from different visions. He felt it was very productive time, and it was worth the effort expended. It was a very successful period of time and process. Now secondarily to this, the Committee should have an in-depth discussion and analysis of ETC. Mike stated that Cynthia has synthesized the results of the dots as well as Jim's analysis. John replied that he wants to use a lot of discretion because this was not scientific. From his point of view, he observed that a lot of what he believed might be out there was not out there.

Gerhard stated that the set-up process was streamlined by the end, especially with the help of the city staff. He felt the outcome was surprising. The attendance was amazing, and he was flabbergasted to see different people at the meetings. At the first meeting he heard an exciting compliment from someone stating that they should take this to a higher level, maybe D.C. He heard a couple questions, like eliminating the need for imported produce and why there were so many dots at the airport mesa. He saw some individuals with a few sheets of blue dots. He has some concern about the scientific outcome and what they are going to take out of this. He felt this was an exercise that people liked because they could touch and feel the experience. He was excited about this and felt the Committee did a good job.

Elemer stated that there were 92 blue dots on airport mesa on environment. He observed that when John told the crowd that the Committee needs their help, he could feel a palpable reaction. People responded to this. The second most powerful thing was the gesture of giving the blue dots and saying that people can make a difference, a contribution. He stated that he hopes this happens within the Committee, and that the Committee members themselves get the same number of "blue dots". He heard questions from people questioning not the ETC but the bigger scheme of what power the Committee or the Plan really has. He also referenced a negative letter from a community member. He also indicated that he heard from others that they felt that they were being funneled into only three paths and their choices were limited.

Jim Eaton commended John Sather for the time, effort and sacrifice on his part and on that of his company. John interjected that many others put in hours and effort, but thanked Jim. Jim went on to say that he photographed and tabulated the dots. He is not, however, going to put a lot of credibility into the tabulations of the dots. He feels the results of the tabloid may hold more weight because people had time to think about it, and because they could only make one choice or one preference, as opposed to those that abused the blue dot system. He would like to see the results of the tabloid separated, He referenced the yellow dots and that they were concentrated in the middle. He looks forward to seeing the tabloid results. He stated that there is a lot of information the Committee doesn't have. Moving forward, the Committee needs to carefully analyze the results of the tabloid and website and find out what we need to know.

Marty pointed out Mike Bower, John Sather, Gerhard Mayer, Cynthia Lovely - they all contributed in a meaningful way. He did not hear anything negative. He put together his own word cloud. "Creek Walk" is one of those words. He heard a lot of pro and con discussion. "Transportation" - this also had a lot of conversation. He heard the word "impressive" a lot in terms of presentation. "Best of each" - it would be great to take a little of each of these things. He also heard comments about what the Committee will do with this afterwards. He stated that he had been somewhat critical of over-planning, but this worked. The community took to this quickly, and he was pleased and proud of the Committee and the community.

Barbara wrote down a couple of words, one of which was "Impressive". The presentation was clear, intelligent and impressive. People understood and were excited about this. The visions were exciting. Taking properties to give the ETC a concrete reality was an important tool. People were balanced; they seemed to accept the different ideas of tourism, environment, etc. There was a feeling of optimism and a good feeling about the future and the feeling of Sedona. One woman expressed some fear that she could not bring her car into the city; she also heard the Agenda 21 paranoia about government. Taking that out of it, it was overall a positive experience. She stated that she was proud to be a part of the Committee.

Angela stated her agreement with the statements thus far. She compared these meetings to the Forest Service meetings she was recently at, and she stated that the Committee's meeting outshone and was amazing. She felt that it was impressive. She agrees with the reservations about the blue dot analysis. She referenced the newspaper editorial on the community plan, which sent the message that people have to be realistic also. She stated that this was a shame. The biggest issue she heard about was regarding a central gathering place. She also heard questions about the Sedona Land Trust. She commented that there was a diverse crowd present. She commented on the letter that was received and that it does not reflect the feelings of Sedona.

Cynthia stated that the numbers from the sign-up sheets were almost equal – 79.70, 80. Gerhard stated that the sign-up sheets did not reflect the attendance; he took a headcount.

Mike commented that the Committee did a superb job, and the public reaction was generally very positive. There always are a few folks that don't understand what this is, but you have to look past that. It was all very good.

Gerhard stated that Audree said that this could be a model for other communities.

Jon Thompson stated that the blue dots should be taken with a grain of salt and was a group participation thing. His first reaction was relief, because it went so well and also because people understood that this was about imagining and not a plan. He cannot imagine that anything could have been done more elaborately or have been advertised better. The Committee received the maximum response from the community. This has to be weighed against the 50% or better that will actually vote. He currently feels the Committee has strong credibility right now and would like to put that to good use - he wishes the Committee could write the plan and vote on it tomorrow. He then asked for further comments.

Sandy Moriarty stated that overwhelmingly the Committee was thanked and appreciated. The people loved this, and it's because they got to participate and do something. They could talk or not talk if they wanted. The Committee also thanked Sandy for her participation.

Vice Mayor DiNunzio expressed that he had the same experience at the West Sedona School. He thinks this was an outstanding way to communicate – unstructured and unmanipulated. He encouraged the Committee to go with their gut on this. He stated this was outstanding work.

Sandy Moriarty stated that she was surprised that people understood all of this. Jon Thompson responded by saying that the first batch of written responses seems to reflect those that were at the meetings. The later comments seem to reflect those not at the meetings and some misunderstanding of the process.

10. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items.

Angela asked if this office needs to be staffed this week. Jon Thompson stated that it does not need to be additionally staffed; he will be here.

The next meeting is Tuesday, February 5, 2013. Mike stated that for future agenda items, the process discussion needs to be on the agenda. Marty asked if this could be the only agenda item. Jon Thompson replied that there is one item on the agenda that Elemer today deferred. The report from the Format Committee can be delayed. The article that Marty presented can be put off. Marty stated that the process should be concentrated on. John Sather stated that the Format Team presentation is in his idea of the process.

Jon Thompson stated that the meeting schedule is again the 1st and 3rd Tuesday. The agenda items will include ETC results, what we can learn and further analysis if needed. They will start with the process. The Outreach Committee is suspended for the moment. Marty stated that the next step after this is how to restructure the Committee. Mike mentioned that they also need to have the drawing.

11. Adjournment

The Chairman called for adjournment at 5:13pm, without objection.

Respectfully Submitted,

Johannah M. Rutschow

Date